

University Avenue Central Corridor Task Force Meeting
May 17, 2007
Central Corridor Resource Center
Meeting Summary

University Task Force members present: Reggie Aligada (co-chair), Marilyn Porter (co-chair), Veronica Burt, James Erkel, Robert Straughn, Anne White, Joan Grzywinski, Seitu Jones, Betty Charles, Richard Kleinbaum, Byron Moore, Brian Winkelaar

University Task Force members absent: Julie Causey (co-chair), Courtney Henry, Jonathan Sage-Martinson, Nieeta Presley, Juan Linares, Vatou Her, Mai Thor, Bao Vang

Staff present: Donna Drummond, Sarah Zorn, Va-Megn Thoj,

Others present: Myron Medcalf, Joe Samuel, Karri Plowman, Jane McClure, Vic Rosenthal, Jo Haberman, Susan Kimberly, Linda Jungwirth, Dan Kravetz, Dave Stokes, Paula Maccabee, Brian McMahon, George Johnson

The meeting was called to order by co-chair Reggie Aligada. He welcomed everyone and introductions of the task force members, City staff and audience members were made. He stated that the goal for the meeting was to discuss and finalize the interim overlay as recommended by the task force.

Donna Drummond said she had not received any comments regarding the executive summary draft and mentioned that a mock-up of the poster was available to look at but that it still needs some tweaking.

Reggie explained the proceedings for the interim overlay and asked for a motion to begin discussion. Seitu Jones moved to accept the PED proposed overlay that was based on input from the 5/10 meeting. The motion was seconded by Anne White.

Reggie asked that any proposed amendments be stated for discussion. Amendments regarding the following issues were proposed:

1. Parking Requirements
2. Parking Placement
3. Use Restrictions
4. Boundary Adjustments
5. Area it Applies to
6. FAR

A motion to amend the original motion was withdrawn because, after discussion, it was found to be identical to the original motion.

Parking Requirements:

A compromise was proposed to “reduce the minimum amount of parking required to 60% of the current parking requirements and limit the maximum amount of parking allowed to 75% of current requirements.” The amendment is meant to be a compromise from the 50% minimum that was proposed by University UNITED; the intent is to make sure that too much surface parking isn’t provided in the Corridor.

The amendment was seconded and opened for discussion.

The Midway TMO study, which showed lots at peak hours less than 75% full, was cited as evidence that parking requirements need to be reduced. Clarification was requested regarding the PED proposed reduction to 75%; it was explained that this figure is used in the TN2 designation, along transit streets and is a level that the city has some experience with but would have to be studied further in the zoning study. There was some discussion about where parking standards come from and the idea that the amount of parking is typically a result of the retailer demand. The original amendment was revised to a maximum of 85% of current parking requirements. There was a friendly amendment to split the amendment into two and vote separately on the minimum and maximum. This amendment was seconded.

A vote was taken on setting the minimum parking requirement to 60%

Yes – 9 No – 0 Abstain – 1 Motion Passed

A vote was taken on whether to set the maximum to 85% of current parking requirements, with no restriction on structured parking.

Yes – 5 No – 3 Abstain – 2 Motion Passed

Parking Placement:

The proposed amendment was that “the limit on the width of side yard parking (2 rows of parking with a drive isle between) should apply to properties fronting on University Avenue and properties located within station areas.” It was decided that St. Anthony Avenue is a separate issue and that these standards should not apply to the frontage road. The purpose of this amendment is to create more walkable streets and promote a move towards greater density in the area. The issue of corner lots and this amendment being too restrictive to accommodate a reasonable use was brought up. There was also a concern about residential property in the station area. Donna Drummond explained that there is no residential property in the area of change unless it fronts University Avenue or is zoned commercial; she also emphasized that the interim ordinance only applies to new development. A friendly amendment was proposed to include “surface” parking in the original amendment.

A vote was taken on whether to amend the interim overlay to limit the width of side yard parking to two drive isles for property fronting University Avenue and property within the station area, within the area of change.

Yes – 7 No – 2 Abstain – 2 Motion Passed

Use Restrictions:

The following amendment was suggested: “No new drive-through retail, car dealership or auto repair in station areas. Allow other new auto-related businesses to build in station areas as long as they meet the interim zoning requirements.” The purpose is to avoid drive-throughs and curb cuts in areas that are trying to be pedestrian friendly because they slow traffic and it moves away from the desired density. There were concerns from some task force members who thought that some requirements were too restrictive or getting into Phase 2 details, they felt that some of these decisions should be left to PED staff and warranted further study and public meetings. A vote on this amendment was taken.

Yes – 5 No – 6 Abstain - 1 Motion Failed

The question was called and seconded. A vote was taken as to whether to vote on the interim overlay as it is at this point or to continue discussing it and entertaining amendments.

Yes – 4 No – 6 Abstain - 0 Motion Failed

Boundary Changes:

An amendment was proposed as follows: “along proposed Dale Station, limit the area of change to property fronting the Avenue.” The purpose is to avoid residential areas, the only area at the Dale station that should be redeveloped is the Unidale site, which would exclude institutions that are important to residences in the area. The amendment was seconded. There was discussion as to whether the Unidale site could be split and those parcels not fronting University Avenue would then not be subject to the overlay regulations. Following a 2004 study, the Unidale site was rezoned to TN2, which prompted discussion regarding whether the amendment should just include those sites that are zoned TN2; it was discovered that this would exclude sites along University that should be subject to the requirements. A vote was taken on the amendment as previously stated.

Yes – 4 No – 6 Abstain – 0 Motion Failed

Area it Applies to:

There was an amendment proposed to include the KSTP property and the area between Pelham and Hwy 280, south of Franklin in the area of change. The amendment was seconded. There was a concern about the loss of prime industrial land and it was pointed out that the sites were currently being used for office space, with the potential to be redeveloped to a more intensive use in the future.

A vote was taken whether to include the KSTP site and the area between Pelham and Hwy 280, south of Franklin in the “area it applies to.”

Yes – 7 No – 3 Abstain – 1 Motion Passed

Floor Area Ratio

An amendment to change the area exempted from FAR requirements from between “Prior and Hampden” to between “Prior and Vandalia.” Industrial land between Vandalia and Hampden should not be exempt from FAR requirements because it is not currently being used for industrial purposes. The area has a strip mall and various businesses, which are ripe for redevelopment due to their location and proximity to the freeway. The amendment was seconded. A vote was taken whether to change “Hampden” to “Vandalia.”

Yes – 10 No – 1 Abstain – 0 Motion Passed

Other Amendments:

A new amendment was introduced to exclude St. Anthony Avenue from the parking placement requirement as stated in the interim overlay document. The amendment was seconded. A vote was taken.

Yes – 10 No – 1 Abstain – 0 Motion Passed

A new amendment was introduced to “exempt everything south of Fuller from the area it applies to, within the Dale station area” in order to avoid any residential or institutional uses. The amendment was seconded and a vote was taken.

Yes – 6 No – 3 Abstain – 2 Motion Passed

The question was called to vote on the overlay and amendments to this point. The motion was seconded and a vote was taken.

Yes – 10 No – 1 Abstain – 0 Motion Passed

A letter to the Mayor was proposed suggesting that a small business czar or ombudsman position be created. Karri Plowman of the Central Corridor Partnership pointed out that there are positions within various organizations that are waiting to be filled and suggested waiting rather than creating something new at this point.

Donna Drummond gave a brief overview of Phase 2 saying that the zoning study would be completed within the interim overlay period; station area planning would be completed by the end of preliminary engineering and pointed out that other task forces and initiatives are getting started which will identify initiatives for implementation.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:25 p.m.

Meeting summary prepared by Sarah Zorn, PED planning staff.